

### LEGEND

Staff Recommendations

Expressway/Prime Arterial (6.1,2)

Major Road Series (4.1)

Boulevard Series (4.2)

Community Collector Series (2.1)

Light Collector Series (2.2)

Minor Collector Series (2.3)

Local Public Road (LPR)

Fire Access Road (FA)

Deleted/Unbuilt Road

Road Components

Raised Median

Continuous Turn Lane

Intermittent Turn Lane

Improvement Options\*

Reduced Shoulder

Proposed CE Roadway Standards

\* Passing Lane, Intermittent Turn Lane, Turnouts, Etc.

Matrix Key & Level of Community Concurrence

Agree

Minor Disagreement

Major Disagreement

No Action

August 24, 2006

North Mountain: Proposed CE Road Network

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>1 Palomar Divide Drive (SA 140)</b> <u>Segment</u> : Entire road <u>Existing Condition</u> : Unbuilt <u>Current Classification</u> : Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Delete CE Road</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – Projected traffic volumes do not meet CE threshold</li> <li>• <i>Maximize Traffic Movement</i> – Mapped road ends; does not enhance connectivity</li> <li>• <i>Minimize Costs</i> – Road is not needed to support forecast traffic volumes</li> </ul>
<b>2 Canfield Road / S6 (SF 1417.1)</b> <u>Segment</u> : Entire road <u>Existing Condition</u> : 2 lanes <u>Current Classification</u> : Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Local Public Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – Projected traffic volumes are low in this area</li> <li>• <i>Maximize Traffic Movement</i> – Connects to a dead-end CE road and therefore, does not enhance connectivity</li> </ul>
<b>3 South Grade Road (SF 1417)</b> <u>Segment</u> : Pala-Pauma boundary to Canfield Road <u>Existing Condition</u> : 2 lanes <u>Current Classification</u> : Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Minor Downgrade</b> 2.3C Minor Collector (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – Proposed road classification will operate at LOS A-C</li> <li>• <i>Minimize Environmental Impacts</i> – Lower design speed is more consistent with existing topography</li> </ul>
<b>4 East Grade Road / S7 (SC 320)</b> <u>Segment</u> : Entire road <u>Existing Condition</u> : 2 lanes <u>Current Classification</u> : Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Minor Downgrade</b> 2.3C Minor Collector (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – Proposed road classification will operate at LOS A-C</li> <li>• <i>Minimize Environmental Impacts</i> – Lower design speed is more consistent with existing topography</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>5 Unnamed Road (SC 330)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire road <u>Existing Condition:</u> Unbuilt <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Delete CE Road</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – Projected traffic volumes are low and do not warrant a CE road</li> <li>• <i>Minimize Costs</i> – Road would be very expensive to build</li> <li>• <i>Minimize Environmental Impacts</i> – Road alignment is within Tier I habitat and Open Space (Conservation) land use designation</li> </ul>
<b>6 Highway 76</b> <u>Segment:</u> Pala-Pauma boundary to SR-79 <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Major Road (4+ lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.1D Community Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – A 2-lane road is sufficient to meet forecast traffic volumes; wider right-of-way for optional or periodic passing lane accommodates higher traffic volumes on State highways</li> </ul>
<b>7 Mesa Grande Road (SC 390 / SC 400)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Minor Downgrade</b> 2.3C Minor Collector (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – Proposed road classification will operate at LOS A-C</li> <li>• <i>Minimize Environmental Impacts</i> – Lower design speed is more consistent with existing topography</li> </ul>
<b>8 Black Canyon Road (SA 290)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Ramona boundary to Mesa Grande Road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Local Public Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – CE road is not needed to support projected traffic volumes</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>9 Sutherland Dam Road (SC 890)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Black Canyon Road to end of CE classified portion <u>Existing Condition:</u> Unpaved <u>Current Classification:</u> Collector Road (4 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Local Public Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – CE road is not needed to support projected traffic volumes</li> <li>• <i>Minimize Environmental Impacts</i> – Adjacent to Sutherland Reservoir</li> </ul>
<b>10A SR-78</b> <u>Segment:</u> Ramona boundary to SR-79 <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Mountain (2 lanes)	<b>Minor Upgrade</b> 2.1D Community Collector with Improvement Options (2+ Lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – A 2-lane road is sufficient to meet forecast traffic volumes</li> </ul>
<b>10B SR-78 / Julian Road</b> <u>Segment:</u> SR-79 to Julian boundary <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Mountain (2 lanes)	<b>Minor Upgrade</b> 2.2D Light Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – A 2-lane road is sufficient to meet forecast traffic volumes; wider right-of-way for optional or periodic passing lane accommodates higher traffic volumes on State highways</li> </ul>
<b>11 Chihuahua Valley Road (SA 150)</b> <u>Segment:</u> SR-79 to Riverside County boundary <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes / unbuilt <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Equivalent Classification</b> 2.2E Light Collector (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – A 2-lane road is sufficient to meet forecast traffic volumes</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>12A SR-79</b> <u>Segment:</u> Riverside County boundary to San Felipe Road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Major Road (4+ lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.1D Community Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – A 2-lane road is sufficient to meet forecast traffic volumes; wider right-of-way for optional or periodic passing lane accommodates higher traffic volumes on State highways</li> </ul>
<b>12B SR-79 (unbuilt alignment)</b> <u>Segment:</u> San Felipe Road to SR-79 (unbuilt realignment) <u>Existing Condition:</u> unbuilt <u>Current Classification:</u> Major Road (4+ lanes)	<b>Delete CE Road</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Minimize Costs</i> – New road should not be constructed when CE road can follow existing SR-79 alignment</li> </ul>
<b>12C SR-79</b> <u>Segment:</u> San Felipe Road to SR-79 (unbuilt realignment) <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> N/A	<b>Minor Upgrade</b> 2.1D Community Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Minimize Costs</i> – Mapped CE road should not be constructed when CE road can follow existing SR-79 alignment</li> </ul>
<b>12D SR-79 (unbuilt realignment)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Unnamed road (SC 330) to SR-79 <u>Existing Condition:</u> Unbuilt <u>Current Classification:</u> Major Road (4+ lanes)	<b>Delete CE Road</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – Projected traffic volumes are low and do not warrant a CE road</li> <li><i>Minimize Costs</i> – Road is not needed to support forecast traffic volumes</li> <li><i>Minimize Environmental Impacts</i> – Road alignment impacts Tier I habitat and is within an Open Space (Conservation) land use designation</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>12E SR-79</b> <u>Segment:</u> SR-79 (unbuilt realignment) to SR-78 / Julian Road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Major Road (4+ lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.1D Community Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – A 2-lane road is sufficient to meet forecast traffic volumes; wider right-of-way for optional or periodic passing lane accommodates higher traffic volumes on State highways</li> </ul>
<b>13 Camino San Ignacio / Los Coyotes Road (SC 370)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes / unbuilt <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Local Public Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – CE road is not needed to support projected traffic volumes</li> </ul>
<b>14 Montezuma Valley Road / S22 (SF 1406)</b> <u>Segment:</u> San Felipe Road to Desert boundary <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Collector Road (4 lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2D Light Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – A 2-lane road is sufficient to meet forecast traffic volumes</li> </ul>
<b>15 Grapevine Canyon Road (SC 410)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Local Public Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – Projected traffic volumes are low in this area</li> <li>• <i>Maximize Traffic Movement</i> – Mapped road ends, and therefore does not enhance connectivity</li> </ul>
<b>16 San Felipe Road / S2 (SF 1405)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Collector Road (4 lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2E Light Collector (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – A 2-lane road is sufficient to meet forecast traffic volumes</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>17 Unnamed Road (SC 860)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire road <u>Existing Condition:</u> Unpaved <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Local Public Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – CE road is not needed to support projected traffic volumes</li> </ul>
<b>18A SR-78</b> <u>Segment:</u> Julian boundary to San Felipe Road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Mountain (2 lanes)	<b>Minor Upgrade</b> 2.2D Light Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – A 2-lane road is sufficient to meet forecast traffic volumes; wider right-of-way for optional or periodic passing lane accommodates higher traffic volumes on State highways</li> </ul>
<b>18B SR-78</b> <u>Segment:</u> San Felipe Road to Desert boundary <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Major Road (4+ lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2D Light Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – A 2-lane road is sufficient to meet forecast traffic volumes</li> <li><i>Minimize Environmental Impacts</i> - Lower design speed is more consistent with existing topography</li> </ul>
<b>19 Great Overland Stage Route of 1849 (SA 200)</b> <u>Segment:</u> SR-78 to Desert boundary <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Equivalent Classification</b> 2.2E Light Collector (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – A 2-lane road is sufficient to meet forecast traffic volumes</li> </ul>